

ASK HIM.

There was not a single Radical vote polled in Polk county, Florida, at the late election. Ask Littlefield why this was thus.

SCHURZ AND GRANT.

When Senator Schurz visited Washington a week or two ago, the President was too busy to see him. When he returned to the city, after a few days' absence, he had not time to see the President. Honors are easy. But Schurz has the odd trick.

SCHUCHADZKEZAR II.

The Boston *Congressionalist*, a politico-religious journal with a decided Radical leaning, regrets that President Grant "has backed down and caved in to the herd of unscrupulous politicians which afflict and curse the Republican party." In other words, he has gone to grass, with the rest of the cattle.

REVENUE REFORM.

The Collector of the Fourth North Carolina district enjoys the nice little sum of \$12,000 per annum. This is all allowed by the Government. How much besides he allows himself we are unable to say. Of course no reform is needed in the Revenue department.

IMPEACHMENT OF HOLDEN.

The resolution offered by Mr. Straub, of Orange, yesterday, in the House of Representatives, that W. W. Holden, Governor of North Carolina, be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, looks as if the members of the Legislature intended to heed the wishes of their constituents. The Governor's organ has defiantly dared the House to prefer articles of impeachment. We thank Mr. Straub for giving the people of North Carolina the opportunity, at least, to know whether their representatives appreciate the full meaning of the August elections; whether, hereafter the Constitution and the laws of the State, or the unbridled will of the Governor in office, is to be supreme; whether correct principles or mistaken policy is to direct legislation.

The people of North Carolina will look to the sequel of the movement inaugurated by the resolution of Mr. STRAUB with great anxiety and concern.

PORTER-GRANT IMBROGLIO.

We publish elsewhere the consoling letter written by Admiral Porter to Secretary Wells in 1865, in which that officer speaks his mind about General Grant, and also the model explanation of the Admiral. This is, under existing relations between these two officials, an awkward occurrence, especially so, as the confirmation of Porter as "Admiral" in place of FARRAGUT is pending before the Senate.

Our "smoky Cream," immolating himself on the altar of personal friendship, in semi-heretic imitation of his ancient prototype, exclaims, with considerable melodramatic effect, "I have lost all faith in human nature."

Porter, fearful of the pending confirmation, is doubtful whether to lie into or out of the scutcheon. His first impulse was to deny the authenticity of the letter, but "paper writings" are ugly witnesses. He therefore concludes to condemn himself by admitting that he had perpetrated a slander, and seeks excuse on account of the trials and tribulations of the time at which it was written. The Admiral does not state whether his caustic nervousness was caused from the fear of Butler's powder ship or "rebel" guns.

Altogether the affair is a most interesting episode in the lives of these two prominent officials.

EDUCATION.

When we denounce the raceability which has made way with the money raised for the education of our children, honest men, whether rich or poor, white or black, will hardly be induced to believe that we are opposed to free education. When we tell them that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been raised by taxation for educational purposes, and that other hundreds of thousands of dollars have been realized for the same purpose from the sale of stocks in public works, and that but little of it has been spent upon the education of our youth, and less of it remains in the Public Treasury, it does not follow that we are opposed to free schools. If we tell our people that Northern Radical papers denounce our State as having disgraced herself by neglecting the education of her children, in the face of the fact that so much money has been raised for that purpose, they will not, as a matter of course, regard us as hostile to popular education. If we do not think the Superintendent of Education is one of the best men in North Carolina; if, in fact, we have not much confidence in his moral and personal character, or his ability or desire to discharge his duties in conformity with the best interests of the State, we are perfectly sure that we have the endorsement of those most interested in the education of their children.

This man Ashley has permitted the educational funds to be shamefully wasted without protest, or has himself been a guilty party to the frauds by which they have been lost to the purposes for which they were raised. He has, we firmly believe, attempted to force upon our people, by procuring an educational famine, his peculiar religious and political tenets.—What money he may have spent here or elsewhere was the funds of other people, for which he was sure to get a paying per cent., and he took good care to leave his work when a larger field and a larger salary was offered to him.

He has been the willing and well-paid tool of the Radical party to deceive the ignorant in regard to public education in this State. He has trifled with their credulity, hiding his hypocrisy behind a ready cant and a sacerdotal loyalty. He has managed to saddle his family and their mendicant friends upon the State, and has, in turn, preached, and spoken, and prayed and edited in the service of his party, with

punitive fidelity, never for a single month forgetting to draw his salary of two hundred dollars. To-day he is editing the *Raleigh Standard*, and has been for several months. Yet he and his assistant and clerks are bleeding the Treasury under the pretense of establishing public schools and providing for the education of our children. The people of North Carolina are tired of such stuff. They do demand and must have a proper system of free schools; they demand and must have a Superintendent of Education in whose moral and intellectual worth they have the utmost confidence. The Board of Education must be so constituted that the taxes imposed for educational purposes shall be honestly and faithfully expended. All classes of our children, rich and poor, white and black, must be made to feel that their State will not permit them to grow up in ignorance, but that North Carolina will take care of the intellectual growth of those into whose hands her future destinies will be confided.

No question deserves more attention at the hands of the Legislature or so loudly calls for the intervention of a Convention as much does that of education.

The Annual Address Before the Sampson County Agricultural Society.

Our special correspondent at the Sampson County Fair inadvertently neglected to allude to the Annual Address delivered before the Society, on the second day of the Fair, by Capt. James R. Thigpen, of the *Reconstructed Farmer*. He now proceeds to make amends for his previous inadvertence.

The address was eminently practical in its character and teachings, and to render it thus was the laudable purpose of its author. Work, hard, unremitting labor, was what he chiefly recommended to the farmers of the present day; and he endeavored to impress upon them the wisdom of sound, practical farming and the necessity of acquiring its knowledge, and thus testing science and reducing theory to its proper uses. His estimate of a good farmer, he declared to be the one "who produces most with the least labor, and at the same time adds to the productive qualities of the soil." The practice of wearing out lands and exhausting their productive qualities was strongly condemned, and those farmers who clear land and annually take from its fertilizing qualities, restoring none, were declared to be robbing posterity.

Some most excellent hints were given to parents as to the manner of raising their children upon the farms so as to fit them for the practical duties of life. This country, the speaker declared, has now a sufficiency of practical men for this generation, and it behooves the farmers to train their sons for developing the agricultural, mineral and manufacturing resources of the country, while educating them in the branches of knowledge most useful to intelligent working people. The daughters should be raised in the knowledge of all the duties of housewifery. Most excellent, also, was the advice to young men, to go manfully to work—hard, honorable work—and not remain sitting in idleness wishing for capital wherewith to commence business, or waiting for something to turn up.

The hints as to labor, teams, farm implements, drainage, composting and fertilizers, homemade manures, how to raise compost, preparation of the soil, seeding and cultivating, stock raising, rotation, etc., were most excellent, and met with warm approbation.

Altogether the address was exceedingly creditable to the knowledge and practice of Capt. Thigpen, and made a decided impression.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

From time immemorial the Greek and the Latin Monks have quarreled about the possession of the Holy Places at Jerusalem. In 1853 a fresh dispute broke out between them, and Russia seized this pretext to make new and exorbitant demands upon the Ottoman government. The trouble arose about the repairs of the churches around the Holy Sepulchre, and about a silver star belonging to the Latin Monks at Bethlehem, and which they accused the Greek Monks of having stolen. After an immense waste of words and protocols, in which the representatives of France and Russia dragged out months in negotiations with the Turkish administration, the latter rendered the following decision: That notwithstanding the opposition of the Greek Monks, who claimed that the Church of the Nativity belonged to them exclusively, a key of the principal door should be delivered to the Latins also, and as the stolen star could not be found, that another should be made, at the expense of the government, and given to the Latin Monks.

This decision, although liberal and equitable, dissatisfied both the Latin and the Greek Monks, and the latter appealed to the Czar for redress and protection. This was just the opportunity that Russia desired. She had assumed the position of protector of the Christian populations of Turkey—although since the "Hatti Sherif," or Charter of Guiltless, promulgated in 1830 by the Sultan Abdul Mejid, the Christians needed no protection. This charter guarantees to all the subjects of the Ottoman empire, no matter what their religion may be, a complete equality before the law; and at that very time the Turkish ambassadors at London and Paris were Christians; a Christian Pasha was commander-in-chief of the army, and other Christian Pashas were organizing troops for the defense of the Ottoman empire. But when the strong seeks a quarrel with the weak, any pretext is good. Russia had established an immense fortress and navy yard at Sebastopol. Her fleet in the Black Sea was superior to any that the Turks could oppose. Now, thought the Czar Nicholas, was the time to take another step toward Constantinople. Accordingly, Prince Menzikoff was dispatched as Ambassador Extraordinary to the Ottoman Porte. Shortly after his arrival he presented a diplomatic note, demanding that all the Christian subjects of Turkey be put under the protection of Russia; or, in other words, that Turkey should resign her sovereignty over

twelve millions of her subjects. Only five days were granted the Sultan to give his answer to this exorbitant demand, after which the Russian armies entered the Principalities. The Crimean war followed this arrogant proceeding. Nicholas had thus expected such vigorous action on the part of France and England, but he had gone too far to retract. But before the allied fleets or forces could make their appearance in the Black Sea, the Russian Admiral destroyed the Turkish fleet in the harbor of Sinope, in the Black Sea, after a bloody and unequal action.

Every one knows that the result of the Crimean war was the complete destruction of the fortress and naval station of Sebastopol, and of the Russian fleet in the Black Sea. The treaty of Paris, signed March 30th, 1856, contains the following stipulations, made between Russia on the one part, France, England and Sardinia on the other, Austria and Prussia concurring:

"ART. 7. The contracting parties declare the Bosphorus to be open to all the advantages of international law and the European system. Their Majesties bind themselves, each on his side, to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and guarantee in common the strict observance of this engagement.

"ART. 11. The Black Sea is neutralized. Open to the commercial marine of all nations, its waters and harbors are explicitly and forever closed to war vessels of all nations, either Russian or others, with the exceptions mentioned in Articles 14 and 19.

"ART. 13. Their Majesties, the Emperor of Russia and the Sultan, bind themselves not to establish or maintain any arsenals or navy yards on the Black Sea."

By the articles 14 and 19, referred to above, and by an appendix to the treaty, Russia and Turkey agree to keep in the Black Sea, not exceeding six small naval vessels and four light steamers, exclusively for coast service and revenue. Article 19 stipulates that each of the contracting Powers, including France, England, Austria and Sardinia shall be allowed to keep two small vessels at the mouth of the Danube, all said vessels to obtain a firman or permit from the Ottoman government before they can enter the straits. The pre-existing treaty called the "Straits Convention" is maintained, closing the Dardanelles to all but Turkish vessels of war, in time of peace.

The circular of Prince Gortschakoff, which now excites fears of a general European war, takes the following ground.

The Emperor of Russia announces that he will no longer consider himself bound by the provisions of the treaty of Paris, so far as these limit his sovereignty in the Black Sea, because these provisions have been repeatedly violated by the other parties. Among these violations are the cruise of the Prince of Wales in the Black Sea in an English flag; also a trip of the same kind by Sir Bulwer Lytton; and the appearance of an Austrian squadron at Varna, when the Emperor of Austria was there on a visit; then a recent trip of the Sultan on board a Turkish frigate, against which the Russian envoy protested in vain. Also the permission given to Admiral Farragut to enter the Dardanelles.

For these grievances, which are all more or less frivolous, since it is evident that the spirit of the treaty was not violated, are added more weighty considerations. The introduction of iron old ships unknown and unforseen at the time of the treaty increases the danger of Russia. Then, the "Straits Convention" allows the entrance through the Straits and into the Black Sea of all the fleets of the allies of Turkey as soon as war breaks out, while Russia, being debarred from having or constructing a fleet in the Black Sea, would be completely at their mercy. To this it may be replied, that there is no danger or possibility of aggression on the part of Turkey on the Russian possession in the Black Sea; while a few days would suffice to bring a fleet of iron clads from Sebastopol to Constantinople. For these reasons the Emperor considers himself released from the obligations of the treaty, but protests that he has no intention "to raise the Eastern question," and has no other wish than the preservation and consolidation of peace.

Let us hope that he speaks truly, but every probability is against it. The traditions of his race and country make him necessarily ambitious and unscrupulous. The moment is favorable. The parties who guaranteed the treaty of Paris and on whom Turkey frantically calls for aid, are not able to respond. France is prostrate; Italy is unwilling; England is powerless, even if she were resolute. The opportunity is most tempting. It is known that great concentrations of troops are taking place in Russia, near the Turkish frontier. The Russian press is intensely warlike, and it is highly probable that the Russian Government talks loudest of peace on the very eve of an act of war. It would seem as if the best and perhaps the only chance to preserve peace is to accede to the demands of Russia, which, in themselves, are reasonable enough, and thus to deprive her of all pretext for kindling a new conflagration, of which no one can predict the duration or the extent. England is the party most deeply interested. She may growl for a while, but she will not go to war single-handed to guarantee the treaty of Paris. So that it is most probable that the Czar will be allowed to rebuild quietly the fortress and harbor of Sebastopol and to construct an iron-clad fleet in the Black Sea. If he be satisfied with that for the present, the peace of Europe need not be further broken. But what will happen if, one demand being granted, he makes another; and, according to the policy pursued in 1833, 1839, 1843 and 1853, he marches his armies into the Turkish territory as a preliminary measure? This last phase of the "Eastern Question" may yet become more serious than all the others.

DEATH OF BEDFORD BROWN.

Hon. BEDFORD BROWN, one of North Carolina's most distinguished sons and one of the purest and noblest men in the State died suddenly, at his residence in Caswell county, on last Tuesday evening, at the ripe age of 76 years.

Col. Brown was a representative of an other age, and was one of the few links that

remained to bind us to a past when a pure love of country and a strict adherence to honorable principles were the guide and boast of the leaders of the people. He was born in Caswell county in 1795, was from 1815 for many years a member of the House of Commons, was elected to the United States Senate in 1829, and was re-elected to the same at the expiration of his first term. His name and his example will live long in the memory of the good men of the State.

FROM FAIR BLUFF.—TWO SUPPOSED OUTLAWS CAPTURED.—By a gentleman who arrived in the city last night from Fair Bluff,

we learn that two men were captured near that place on Thursday, who are, with good reason, supposed to be members of the Robeson county gang of outlaws. The circumstances of the case are briefly these:

On Thursday morning, these two men, who are both white, entered a house near Fair Bluff and began to mould bullets.—Both of them were heavily armed, and on being ordered from the premises refused to leave, saying that they went where they pleased and did as they pleased. Suspecting them to be outlaws, a son of the owner of the house went into Fair Bluff and informed some of the citizens there that a gang of the outlaws was advancing on the place. A call was immediately made for men, and a force was organized to meet them. The expedition set out and soon afterwards met the two men near the house at which they had been seen. These began at once to retreat, and soon an indiscriminate firing was begun, but without result. The outlaws endeavored to gain the shelter of a dense swamp that was near at hand, and one of them, the larger and elder of the two, succeeded in reaching it, but the other, a mere stripling, was captured, together with a horse, and a white child that he was carrying.

On Thursday night the roads were picketed and information having been brought in that the escaped outlaw was at a certain house a party started out to capture him. They were unsuccessful and a few of the young men were returning home, when the proposition was made to stop all night at a house near at hand. This was agreed to and the party halted at the gate and gave the usual halloo. The result proved that the outlaw had forced himself into this very house, for as soon as the call was made he sprang to the door, threw it open and began to fire on the party at the gate. This was returned, when he sprang down the steps and crawled under the house. A daring young man followed him and soon succeeded in effecting his capture although he nearly lost his life from a pistol shot from the outlaw. He was taken to Fair Bluff, and both of them are now safely ensconced in the jail at Whiteville.

The younger of the two is uninjured but the last captured was shot in the arm and has also slight wounds in the head and on the chest. Fortunately, none of the citizens who effected the captures are at all injured. As we said before, there is very good reason for supposing these two men to be of the Robeson county gang of outlaws.—It is presumed that they were out on a reconnoitering expedition at the time of the capture, although the presence of the child is not easily accounted for. Their statements are very conflicting, and every circumstance is suspicious. One of them claims to be from Virginia, and the other from Maine. It is to be hoped that they will get their full deserts.

HARD TO STRIKE OUT "WHITE."

The Cincinnati *Enquirer* says: "At the late election in Michigan the question was submitted to the people, by the Republican Legislature, whether they would strike the word 'white' out of the State Constitution, in the suffrage clause, where it restricts voting to white persons. This was considered necessary in order to bring it in harmony with the Fifteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. It was not supposed that there would be any opposition to this procedure, which the progress of events had apparently rendered inevitable. But to the astonishment of the Republican managers, a State which they carried even this fall by fifteen thousand majority, falters upon this question, and if the friends of the 'striking out' are not beaten, they have only succeeded by a majority of a few hundred! It would seem that a large portion of the Republican party in Michigan are desirous of administering a rebuke to those who ratified the amendment in their name, without their consent, even if the act carries with it no practical force or effect."

[COMMUNICATED.]

Our Southern brethren, many of the best and bravest among them, who fought against the Government, are impatiently longing to fight once more under the starry folds of the old flag. Give the privilege to the brave sons of the South to defend their country again in a foreign war, and especially one with Great Britain, which is not valued more by them than by us, and it would bring us all together again.—*Extract from Gen. Butler's speech.*

The war passage in Gen. Butler's late Boston speech, now almost forgotten, largely attracted the attention of the Southern press, likely on account of the singular contrast between the honeyed phrases of the speaker, in reference to the "Southern brethren," and the unrelieved ruffianism of his career, when his power as a satrap was unlimited. In the various comments it evoked, one sentiment was predominant—scorn of the man and of his utterances. From this view the writer is compelled to dissent. He has been too long in the habit of observing the immaculate course of the Chief Justice and the Associates to discard fair play, even when the conduct or rights of an unbefamed personage are in question. The vexed passage is not all rodomontade. If closely examined it will be found to contain valuable information and suggestions. Political seers may ridicule the notion of a new European embroilment. The authority of a great republican, a "Triton of the minnows," the physician that applied emollients to the chafed spirit of Calcasieu, gives assurance that a war is approaching in which the greatest part of the civilized world will eventually take part. It is true Butler only expressed a longing for war with England, but considering his access to the best sources of information, and the

embodiment of some of his views in the President's message, his words may be taken as predictive of the gathering storm, and of the action of the Cabinet (if not thwarted) when it bursts forth.

Wherever, on the side of the Confederates, every means and purpose of resistance had vanished, and "the fast-fettered hands made vengeance in vain," there did his countenance wax fiercer and his blows fall heavier. The "brethren" never became the objects of his daring till they had ceased to be the objects of his dread. A man with such antecedents must have a strong propelling motive for raising the war cry, and lauding, in any way, the men of whom, both in Congress and out of it, he has been for years the most relentless foe. His incentive to war with England, he says, is the perpetuation of Republicanism for a generation. This is true in part; for when the Republican party falls down and breaks its skull, Ben comes tumbling after.

But his main incentive is spoons. In the invading expedition, Ben is determined to invade) he will be invested with a high command; and whilst the rest of the army is engaged in the field or in capturing cities, the Butler choice corps will be employed, apart from the danger, in ferreting out the chiefly favorite domestic utensil. The rich harvest which he reaped in New Orleans and other fields fertile in spoons, gave him a tolerably high rank in Boston, but the pre-eminence he has attained in infancy makes him impatient of holding a secondary place in any other sphere. Now, since he has found mansion in England boasts more spoons than any Southern city that was ever under the shadow of Ben's guardian pockets, and antique metrical lore affirms that the dish runs with the spoon, the General, after a long and arduous campaign, has returned home with plate enough to make him a Shoddy of the Sheddies, perhaps may set him up as a golden calf, at the sacrifice of the generic cognomen, beast, to a specific and unalterable designation.—Who then will dare to say that Butler is not made of good metal? Spoon Knight or Spoony will probably be the title of honor awarded to every one who distinguishes himself in the pantry raid.

The composition of the B. branch of our army, the "S. brethren," it seems, are longing to fight under the old flag against England; that is, under Butler himself. Of course, he is confident the brethren will eagerly join any marauding enterprise that promises speedy enrichment, but he is not so sure of their loyalty. He has been through his loyalizing process, that they could earn a living now by showing the agility with which they can pass through the eye of a needle.

Whether the brethren will so act as to verify Butler's pretensions, or, as he says, to themselves, forbids that he should be allowed to move against England without an army from the South.—North Carolina can and will furnish a powerful contingent. The purveying and financial departments she can supply with the officers of the highest qualifications. Pilgrims, superintendents of public instruction, traffickers in railroads, carpet-layers of every hue, &c., &c., who in the art of appropriating what does not belong to them are far ahead of the most expert light-fingered gent in New York or elsewhere. The only difficulty to be apprehended with these officials is, they will require as a bonus all the spoils they may collect, and one hundred per cent. for collecting it. The veritable Sol. Foul and the rest of the faculty of our once University must accompany the troops to astonish Oxford and Cambridge with the extent of their erudition; provided they are not leased out beforehand to some traveling manager, according to the recommendation of the Governor, who has sent a list of his Sinbad attachments. Bobbitt can be placed for a while at the head of the dueling department, in order that he may challenge and back out the whole British Parliament. Until officers corresponding to the merits of Torrance and Senator Pool, are established, the gentlemen shall be furnished with a pair of three cent whistles, and made useful in playing dirges for the loss sustained by the State in the secession of themselves and their companions.

A great Judge has also to be selected, one who will right or wrong, be indifferent to the rights of the people, and according to his prejudices and partialities; his judgment must conform, as far as possible, to the formula: a drunken man sleeps soundly; a sound sleeper meditates no evil; one who meditates no evil shall not be a judge of the law. Therefore, a certain tectotal dignitary shall, as soon as he dies, be carried by spirits to the bosom of Ben Butler, if the latter has the kindness to prepare the adamant receptacle by day.

There must be the august Supreme Court, before the troops, the new bond union between J. Pearson and the Rad. Cav. (first published in Russian Poland), which bond declares on the one part, that law resides in the swords of cut throats and in the defiance of law, to commit unlawful acts, on the other, that the unjust lawless ruler must always override both natural and positive law. But it is in the material for the rank and file that North Carolina soars above rivalry. She can summon to the standard of Butler a corps of the selected veterans who fought under the stars and stripes at Berken and Bergen, in the Caswell and Alamance wars. Talk of the rapidity of Prussian conquests! In a campaign of a few days, these warriors, rushing with irresistible force through opposing columns of air, subdued an army of one thousand men, entrenched in the deepest caverns of the earth, all the supplies of said army being conveyed on the tail of a comet; and they also captured the whole munitions of the enemy—a cane and a pistol.

The conditions that figured in the same war and were commanded by Gen. Clark, will constitute a most important part of the army of invasion. Of that chieftain, trebly refined in the furnace of war, it may be truly said "there is no dangerous action can peep out, but he is thrust upon it." He must now ascend higher in the climax of chivalry and be enabled to address his soldiers in the thrilling words: "For the fourth time I have girded on my sword."

BILL BELLOC.

The Colusa, Cal.; Sun relates a thrilling scene in a court room at that place. The justice and an attorney disagreed, and the judge brought a revolver in requisition and "made for" the attorney, who retreated to the hall, the court in full pursuit. The attorney stopped, the court hung fire, the prisoners, shaking with fear, made their exit by most of the door and into the hall, while the jury, who involuntarily raised from their seats with fright, made a grand rush for the stairway, soon gained the street and scattered in every direction.

The following letter of Mrs. Lee to Mr. Timberlake, of Augusta, sets at rest the discussion as to the middle name of Gen. Robert Lee:

It is with pleasure, my dear sir, I believe, to give you the desired information regarding the name of my husband, which is Robert Edward, not Edmund. He was named for two names, viz. Mr. Robert and Mr. Edward Carter, of Shirley, the old family seat of his mother's family. I have no doubt that you will find it a great pleasure in my mind to know that a nation mourns with me.

MARY CUSTIS LEE.

Porter and Grant.

[COPY.]

NORTH ATLANTIC SQUADRON,

U. S. FLAGSHIP "ALbatross,"

CAPE HART, Jan. 21, 1865.

MY DEAR SIR: I received your kind letter of the 17th inst., and thank you warmly for the confidence you reposed in my good opinion that this place could be taken.

To the Navy Department alone is the country indebted for the capture of this rebel stronghold, for had it not been for your perseverance in keeping the fleet here, and your constant propositions made to the army, nothing would have been done. As it was, after the proposition had been received, and Gen. Grant promised that troops should be sent, it was not difficult for me to consent to let the matter go on, and when he hoped to reap some little credit for the explosion of the powder boat. Now, the country gives Gen. Grant the credit of inaugurating the expedition, when, on both occasions, he permitted it to go forward only by my consent. At first place it had neither head nor tail as far as the army was concerned. In the second place he (Grant) sent too few men, when he ought to have calculated that the rebels would have more strongly defended the works, after seeing what a narrow escape they had. Nothing but the most desperate fighting and a determination to win on the part of the army gave us the victory. The gallant band of sailors who fearlessly went into the works amidst a shower of canister and bullets, drew the enemy's attention away from the assault on the land side, and enabled the troops to obtain a sure footing. I don't say this to detract from the gallantry of the soldiers, for never did men fight harder or more bravely than the sailors did on that day. Now, the most important fact on the coast has been gained, as usual you will hear but little of what the navy did, and I no doubt efforts will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its duty. Three days before the navy might have operated and did not. He knows as much about it as he did when he wrote to me saying "the only way in which the place could be taken was by running the ships past the batteries." He is right, and I am sure that the navy did its duty, and I do not doubt that the navy will be made again to show that the work was not "substantially injured as a defensive work." To Gen. Grant, who is always ready to take the credit when anything is done, and equally ready to lay the blame of the failure on the navy when a failure takes place, I feel under no obligations for receiving and allowing a report to be spread abroad that the navy did not do its